Alexis Mager Lakusta, in propria persona 1259 El Camino Real #245 Menlo Park, CA 94025 (650) 566-9971

E-filing

FILED

MAY 2 5 2007

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SAN FRANCISCO, CA

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

NORTHERN DISTINCT OF CALIFORNIA

3085

In re:

Alexis Mager Lakusta,

Debtor, Appellant

¹¹ || ∨.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mark H. Evans, et al.,

Appellees

Case No.: No. 02-31521

Chapter 7

Adv. Proc. No. 03-3549 TC

APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO RE-FILE APPEAL FROM ORDER DENYING DEBTOR'S MOTION FOR ABANDONMENT

Pursuant to Judge Thomas E. Carlson's ORDER DECLARING ALEXIS

LAKUSTA A VEXATION LITIGANT AND ENJOINING CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS, appellant hereby files this application for leave to re-file his appeal from Judge Carlson's ORDER DENYING DEBTOR'S MOTION FOR ABANDONMENT entered on May 12, 2006. Also Pursuant to Judge Carlson's "vexatious litigant" order, appellant attaches a copy of that order and a copy of the documents he seeks leave to file.

Appellant has been repeated denied his due process rights, and he has been denied his "inalienable rights" to possess and protect his property (Article 1, Section 1, California Constitution). Under California real estate and escrow law, Evans unequivocally did not become the owner of Mr.

Lakusta's Woodside properties. The allegedly valid "Settlement Agreement and Release" is therefore not legally enforceable because it is not a contract under California law.

This case is centrally about title fraud, escrow fraud, and deed theft. It is also about settlement fraud. Officers of the court who regularly appear before this Court have aided and abetted the Evans/LaFountain (Chicago Title Company) scheme to defraud appellant and his creditors (U.S. criminal code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 9, §157 – "bankruptcy fraud"), and their misconduct has been kept from the view of the Court through an intentional violation of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Civil Rules of this Court – the improper (and ineffective) dismissal of appellant's first adversary proceeding – and by relentless and continuing violations of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, including but not necessarily limited to repeatedly making false representations to this Court as is prohibited by Rule 9011(b), (1) through (4).

Ms. Catherine Robertson in particular refuses to comply with the Local Civil Rules of this Court or with Federal Bankruptcy Procedure Rule 9011(b). She displays little regard for the California Rules of Professional Conduct or the State Bar Act, and Pahl and Gosselin knowingly stands in continuous breach of its duty of loyalty to its first client, Mr. Lakusta.

....where lawyers appear in an action against a party whom they represent in another, though unrelated action, they must be disqualified.....The duty of loyalty to the first client prohibited the firm from representing the second client to any extent in the action. This duty overrode the second client's right to retain counsel of its choice. (Opinion by Rylaarsdam, Acting P.J., with Moore and Fybel, JJ., concurring.)
Cal West Nurseries, Inc., Petitioner, v. Superior Court of Orange

County, Respondent; A.J. West Ranch. LLC, Real Party in Interest. 129 Cal.App.4th 117029 Cal.Rptr.3d 170 [May 31, 2005]

Pahl and Gosselin has demonstrated its full complicity in the Evans/
LaFountain conspiracy to defraud appellant and his legitimate creditors in an on-going equity theft scam operation. Evans and his successive attorneys, along with Mr. Boone, have acted both to circumvent and to undermine the explicit intentions and purposes of the California legislature in enacting the Home Equity Sales Contract Act (Civil Code §1695 et seq.). Those purposes and intentions include the preservation and protection of home equities for the homeowners of this state. Pahl and Gosselin was hired by Mr. Lakusta to protect his real estate equity. Instead, Pahl and Gosselin has quite literally stolen the home equity of its first client for the benefit of its new client.

Appellant has and will continue to take entirely appropriate and lawful measures to preserve and protect his and his creditors' rights and property, and he respectfully requests the cooperation of the Court in upholding and enforcing the laws of this state and the Federal Rules of Civil and Bankruptcy Procedure.

Dated: May 24, 2007

Alexis Mager Lakusta,
Debtor, Appellant

Page 3 of 22

C 1	U.S BANKRUF NORTHERN D	ANKLIN, CLERK					
2	Signed and Filed: September 08, 2006						
3							
		1146/1					
4		THOMAS E. CARLSON					
5		U.S. Bankruptcy Judge					
6							
7							
8	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT						
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
10	7						
11	In re) Case No. 02-31521 STC					
12	ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA,)					
13) Chapter 7					
14	Debtor.)					
15) }					
16	ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA,) Adv. Proc. No. 03-3549 TC					
17	Plaintiff,)					
18	vs.)					
19	MARK H. EVANS; SHARON LA FOUNTAIN;)))					
20	and ALVIN C. SILVERNAGEL,) Date: August 11, 2006) Time: 9:30 a.m.					
		Ctrm: Hon. Thomas E. Carlson 235 Pine Street					
21	Defendants.) San Francisco, CA					
22							
23	ORDER DECLARING ALEXIS LAKUSTA	A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT AND					
24	ENJOINING CERTAIN FUT						
25	The court held a hearing at the	above date and time on					
26	Defendant Mark Evans' Motion to Declare Alexis Lakusta a Vexatious						
27	Litigant. Catherine Scholmann Robert	son appeared for Mark Evans.					
28	Alexis Lakusta appeared <u>in pro per</u> .						
		•					
31	ORDER DECLARING LAKUSTA A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT, ETC1-						

Upon review of the motion, upon due consideration, and for the reasons stated on the record at the hearing and in the accompanying memorandum, the court orders as follows.

- (1) Mr. Lakusta is permanently enjoined from filing: (a) in any state or federal court; (b) against Mark Evans, Sharon La Fountain, Alvin D. Silbernagel, Old La Honda Properties, or their attorneys, affiliates, employees, insurers, agents or any other person or entity; (c) any claims, defenses, demands, rights, or causes of actions, whether direct or indirect, absolute or contingent arising out of or otherwise concerning the "2002 Transactions," the "Settlement Agreement," the "Settlement Order" or the "Judgment," as those terms are defined in the accompanying memorandum.
- (2) Mr. Lakusta may obtain relief from this permanent injunction by applying for relief to the above-signed. Mr. Lakusta shall attach to any such request for relief a copy of this order and a copy of the document(s) Mr. Lakusta seeks leave to file.

END OF ORDER

Court Service List

Alexis Mager Lakusta
1259 El Camino Real, Suite 245
Menlo Park, CA 94025-4208

Catherine Schlomann Robertson, Esq.

Catherine Schlomann Robertson, Esq. 225 West Santa Clara Street Suite 1500 San Jose, CA 95113-1700

7 Aron M. Oliner, Esq.
Law Offices of Duane Morris
8 1 Market Spear Tower #2000
San Francisco, CA 94105-1411

Alexis Mager Lakusta, in propria persona 1259 El Camino Real #245 Menlo Park, CA 94025 (650) 566-9971

4

1

2

3

5 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
6 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In re:

Alexis Mager Lakusta,

Debtor, Appellant

11 || v

Mark H. Evans, et al.,

Appellees

Case No.: No. 02-31521

Chapter 7

Adv. Proc. No. 03-3549 TC

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Pursuant to the dismissal-without-prejudice order signed by the Honorable Sandra Brown Armstrong, United States District Judge, on March 27, 2007 (copy attached), Alexis Mager Lakusta hereby re-files his appeal from the ORDER DENYING DEBTOR'S MOTION FOR ABANDONMENT issued by United States Bankruptcy Judge Thomas E. Carlson and entered on May 12, 2006. This appeal is made under 28 U.S.C. section 158 (a).

A copy of the order being appealed from accompanies this Notice of Appeal. Also being filed with this Notice of Appeal, pursuant to Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, Rule 8001(e), is a separate statement of election to have this appeal heard by the United States District Court.

To avoid duplication of effort and expense, appellant additionally requests that the U.S. District Court Clerk assign this case to the Honorable

NOTICE OF APPEAL - 1

4

6

5

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

William H. Alsup, to whom appellant's appeal from the status conference order issued in connection with appellants's MOTION FOR ABANDONMENT has been assigned.

The names of all parties to the order being appealed from, and the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of their respective attorneys, where applicable or known, are:

> Aron M. Oliner [former counsel to Charles E. Sims, Trustee, deceased] Duane Morris LLP 1 Market, Spear Tower, 20th Fl. San Francisco, CA 94105-1104 (415) 957-3104

Office of the U.S. Trustee 235 Pine Street, Suite 700 San Francisco, CA 94104 (415) 705-3333

Mark H. Evans and Old La Honda Properties, LLC counsel: Catherine Schlomann Robertson

> Pahl and Gosselin 225 West Santa Clara Street, Suite 1500 San Jose, CA 95113-1700 (408) 286-5100

Chicago Title Company

counsel: Kathleen J. Moorhead 100 N. Wiget Lane, Suite 150 Walnut Creek, CA 94598 (925) 930-9550

NOTICE OF APPEAL - 2

1 Sharon E. LaFountain 13651 Saratoga-Sunnyvale Road 2 Saratoga, CA 95070 3 (408) 867-2000 4 counsel: unknown 5 David A. Boone, Esq. 6 counsel: James Robert 7 Roberts and Elliott LLP Ten Almaden Blvd. 8 Suite 500 9 San Jose, CA 96113 10 (408) 275-9800 11 David Duperrault and 12 Silicon Valley Law Group 13 25 Metro Drive, Suite 600 San Jose, CA 95110 14 (409) 573-5700 15 counsel: unknown 16 Wayne A. Silver, Esq. 17 333 W. El Camino Real 18 Sunnyvale, CA 94807 19 (408) 720-7007 counsel: unknown 20 21 Dated: May 24, 2007 Signed: Alxi, Magar Lacetr Alexis Mager Lakusta, 22 in propria persona 23 1259 El Camino Real #245 24 Menlo Park, CA 94025 (650) 566-9971 25

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FILED

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA MAR 2 7 2007

RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND

IN RE

No. C 06-03431 SBA

ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA,

ORDER

Debtor.

 $\cap \subset$

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Debtor Alexis Mager Lakusta commenced the instant bankruptcy appeal pro se in this Court on

May 26, 2006 by filing a notice of appeal. Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 8006 requires

[a]ny party filing a designation of the items to be included in the record shall provide to the clerk a copy of the items designated or, if the party fails to provide the copy, the clerk shall prepare the copy at the party's expense. If the record designated by any party includes a transcript of any proceeding or a part thereof, the party shall, immediately after filing the designation, deliver to the reporter and file with the clerk a written request for the transcript and make satisfactory arrangements for payment of its cost.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 8006. There is no indication that Lakusta has provided the clerk with copies of the items designated on October 11, 2006. *See* Docket No. 11. Specifically, transcripts of hearings have not been received by this Court.

On November 16, 2006, and January 9, 2007, this Court extended the briefing schedule to allow Lakusta time to file his Opening Brief. On January 31, 2007, Lakusta filed an Opening Brief that this Court finds unintelligible. In a letter to the Court on February 21, 2007, Lakusta stated that "[his] Amended Opening Brief will be provided to the Court and to all those on the service list very shortly."

Over one month has passed and the Court has neither received an Amended Opening Brief nor an Amended Designation of Record that includes copies of the items listed.

LEGAL STANDARD

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 8006 requires appellants in bankruptcy appeals to meet certain filing deadlines. Additionally, the requirement of perfection of the record in Rule 8006 serves "to provide the reviewing court with an adequate basis for evaluating the appellant's claims" on a bankruptcy appeal. *In re CPDC Inc.*, 221 F.3d 693, 698 (5th Cir. 2000). It also serves "to put the appellee on notice

Entered on Civil Docket MAR 2 8 200

3

7

8

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

as to which issues it must defend against and whether the appellant's designation of issues will produce a record adequate for the appellate court." In re Winders, 202 B.R. 512, 516 (D. Kan. 1996). "The burden of creating an adequate record rests with the appellant, who may not urge an issue on appeal if he has failed to provide the appellate court with the requisite record excerpts." In re CPDC Inc., 221 F.3d at 698. See also In re Winslow, 121 B.R. 598, 599 (D. Colo. 1990) (a court may dismiss an appeal or affirm the basis of the bankruptcy court's decision when an appellant fails to designate critical parts of the record).

District courts acting in an appellate capacity in relation to bankruptcy court decisions have the discretion to dismiss a bankruptcy appeal for non-compliance with Rule 8006. Fitzsimmons v. Nolden (In re Fitzsimmons), 920 F.2d 1468, 1471 (9th Cir. 1989) (affirming dismissal of appeal for failure to comply with Bankruptcy Rule 8006 where appellant's conduct was dilatory and egregious). See also Fed. R. Bank. Proc. 8001(a); L.R. 8011-1. Pro se appellants are obligated to comply with the Bankruptcy Rules in the same way as the other litigants are. See King v. Atiyeh, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987) ("Pro se litigants must follow the same rules of procedure that govern other litigants.").

ANALYSIS

In his Designation of the Record for Matters on Appeal, Lakusta designates numerous motions, memorandums, transcripts, and judgments. However, Lakusta has not provided the clerk of the Court with a copy of the documents listed in his designation, nor has he paid the bankruptcy court to make copies for him, as required by Rule 8006.

The Court notes that Lakusta's statement of the issues to be presented on appeal is unintelligible. Lakusta filed a motion to compel the trustee to abandon claims of the estate against Mark Evans and other parties. The Bankruptcy Court denied the motion because the claims alleged under the two adversary

proceedings had already been decided. Under the circumstances presented, the Court has the discretion to dismiss the appeal. See Fitzsimmons, 920 F.2d at 1472-73.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this case is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE as to Lakusta's ability to re-file the appeal when he is prepared to proceed in compliance with the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 3-27-067

SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG United States District Judge

The first of the two adversary proceedings identified was dismissed; the second resulted in a judgment against Lakusta and the estate. Debtor, who had prosecuted the action on behalf of the estate, filed a motion for relief from judgment that was denied, but did not appeal either the judgment or the order denying relief from judgment. Debtor now seeks to file a new suit against Evans and other parties for claims arising out of the same transaction as that involved in the action tried to judgment, stating that he "believes there may be grounds to set aside the judgment."

Docket No. 4, Ex. 1, at 1-2.

¹ The Memorandum re Debtor's Motion for Abandonment sheds some light on the issue:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE ALEXIS AGER LAKUSTA et al,

Case Number: CV06-03431 SBA

Plaintiff,

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

٧.

IN RE ALEXIS AGER LAKUSTA et al.

r\					
D٥	et	ei	10	la	nt

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on March 27, 2007, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Office of the U.S. Trustee / SF Office of the U.S. Trustee 235 Pine Street, Suite 700 San Francisco, CA 94104

U.S. Bankruptcy Court, No. District of CA (San Francisco) Clerk's Office 235 Pine Street P.O. Box 7341 San Francisco, CA 94120-7341

Alexis Mager Lakusta 1259 El Camino Real #245 Menlo Park, CA 94025

Aron Mark Oliner Duane Morris, LLP One Market Street, Suite 2000 San Francisco, CA 94105

Catherine Schlomann Robertson Pahl & Gosselin 160 W. Santa Clara St. 14th Fl. San Jose, CA 95113

Thomas E. Carlson USBC-San Francisco for the Northern Dist. of CA 235 Pine St P.O. Box 7341 San Francisco, CA 94104

Dated: March 27, 2007

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk

4:07-cv-03085-SBA Document 1-6_{GLORU}Filed 06/13/2007 Page 15 U.S BANKRUPTCY COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 1 Signed and Filed: May 11, 2006 4 THOMAS E. CARLSON 5 U.S. Bankruptcy Judge 6 7 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA In re Case No. 02-31521 TC ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA, Chapter 7 11 Date: May 12, 2006 Time: 9:30 a.m. 12 Ctrm: Courtroom 23 13 Debtor. 14 15 ORDER DENYING DEBTOR'S MOTION FOR ABANDONMENT Upon due consideration, and for the reasons stated in the 16 accompanying memorandum, the court hereby issues the following order regarding Debtor's motion to compel abandonment of certain legal claims (the Motion). 19 20 The hearing on the Motion, which was scheduled for May (1) 12, 2006 at 9:30 a.m., is hereby vacated. 21 22 (2) The Motion is denied. 23 Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 554, none of the legal claims

- that the estate may have against any party shall be abandoned upon the closing of the case.
- (4) The Order Granting Limited Relief From Stay entered by this court on April 18, 2006 is hereby vacated. Any action that

ORDER DENYING DEBTOR'S MOTION FOR ABANDONMENT

25

26

27

28

was filed pursuant to that Order (New Action) is therefore subject to the automatic stay of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) from this date forward.

(5) Because the claims involved in any New Action have not been abandoned, Trustee remains the real plaintiff in any New Action. Trustee shall sign and submit for filing in any New Action a motion or notice of dismissal prepared by one or more of the defendants to such New Action.

END OF ORDER

ORDER DENYING DEBTOR'S MOTION FOR ABANDONMENT

23

24

25

26

27

28

Page 17 of 22

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

Case Name:

In re Alexis Mager Lakusta

Case Number:

BK Case No. 02-31521

Gary M. Hess declares:

I am over the age of 18 years, not a party to this action, and I am employed at Shmoover Movers in Menlo Park, California.

On May 25, 2007, I placed for collection and mailing, at Menlo Park, California, a copy of the attached:

NOTICE OF APPEAL

STATEMENT OF ELECTION TO HAVE APPEAL HEARD BY THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT

in a sealed envelope, with postage thereon fully prepaid, addressed to:

Aron M. Oliner **Duane Morris LLP** 1 Market St., Spear Tower, 20th Fl. San Francisco, CA 94105-1104 (415) 957-3104 [former counsel to Charles E. Sims, Trustee, deceased]

Office of the U.S. Trustee 235 Pine Street, Suite 700 San Francisco, CA 94104 (415) 705-3333

Mark H. Evans and Old La Honda Properties, LLC counsel: Catherine Schlomann Robertson Pahl and Gosselin 225 West Santa Clara Street, Suite 1500 San Jose, CA 95113-1700 (408) 286-5100

Chicago Title Company counsel: Kathleen J. Moorhead 100 N. Wiget Lane, Suite 150 Walnut Creek, CA 94598 (925) 930-9550

Sharon E. LaFountain 13651 Saratoga-Sunnyvale Road Saratoga, CA 95070 (408) 867-2000 counsel: unknown

David A. Boone, Esq. counsel: James Robert

Roberts and Elliott LLP Ten Almaden Blvd. Suite 500 San Jose, CA 96113 (408) 275-9800

David Duperrault and Silicon Valley Law Group 25 Metro Drive, Suite 600 San Jose, CA 95110 (409) 573-5700 counsel: unknown

Wayne A. Silver, Esq. 333 W. El Camino Real Sunnyvale, CA 94807 (408) 720-7007 counsel: unknown

I am readily familiar with the business's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service, and in the ordinary course of business, the correspondence would be deposited with the United States Postal Service on the day on which it is collected at the business.

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED:

May 25, 2007

Gary M. Hess

STATEMENT OF ELECTION TO HAVE APPEAL HEARD BY U.S. DISTRICT COURT

Document 1-6

Filed 06/13/2007

Page 20 of 22

Case 4:07-cv-03085-SBA

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

Case Name:

In re Alexis Mager Lakusta

Case Number:

BK Case No. 02-31521

Gary M. Hess declares:

I am over the age of 18 years, not a party to this action, and I am employed at Shmoover Movers in Menlo Park, California.

On May 25, 2007, I placed for collection and mailing, at Menlo Park, California, a copy of the attached:

NOTICE OF APPEAL

STATEMENT OF ELECTION TO HAVE APPEAL HEARD BY THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT

in a sealed envelope, with postage thereon fully prepaid, addressed to:

Aron M. Oliner
Duane Morris LLP
1 Market St., Spear Tower, 20th Fl.
San Francisco, CA 94105-1104
(415) 957-3104
[former counsel to Charles E. Sims, Trustee, deceased]

Office of the U. S. Trustee 235 Pine Street, Suite 700 San Francisco, CA 94104 (415) 705-3333

Mark H. Evans and
Old La Honda Properties, LLC
counsel: Catherine Schlomann Robertson
Pahl and Gosselin
225 West Santa Clara Street, Suite 1500
San Jose, CA 95113-1700
(408) 286-5100

Chicago Title Company counsel: Kathleen J. Moorhead 100 N. Wiget Lane, Suite 150 Walnut Creek, CA 94598 (925) 930-9550 Sharon E. LaFountain 13651 Saratoga-Sunnyvale Road Saratoga, CA 95070 (408) 867-2000 counsel: unknown

David A. Boone, Esq. counsel: James Robert

Roberts and Elliott LLP Ten Almaden Blvd.

Suite 500

San Jose, CA 96113 (408) 275-9800

David Duperrault and Silicon Valley Law Group 25 Metro Drive, Suite 600 San Jose, CA 95110 (409) 573-5700 counsel: unknown

Wayne A. Silver, Esq. 333 W. El Camino Real Sunnyvale, CA 94807 (408) 720-7007 counsel: unknown

I am readily familiar with the business's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service, and in the ordinary course of business, the correspondence would be deposited with the United States Postal Service on the day on which it is collected at the business.

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED:

May 25, 2007